

ITEMS

VOLUME 2 • NUMBER 2 • JUNE 1948
230 PARK AVENUE • NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

UNIVERSITY ORGANIZATION FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

by Paul Webbink

RESEARCH in the social sciences is advancing steadily in concrete accomplishment, improvement of research tools and procedures, and quality of research personnel. There is public insistence on the necessity of advancing further and faster. The progress made in recent decades has had heartening repercussions. Financial support for social science research has been provided with increasing frequency, generosity, and freedom. Responsible lay groups, academic administrators, and fellow scientists and scholars in other fields of research have lent increasing cooperation and support to efforts which promise to lead toward a valid science of human relations. Their anticipations, seemingly unmindful of the many years and happy accidents which have entered into the piecemeal building of other sciences, constitute both a stimulating challenge and a cause for concern. If research yields results of demonstrable validity only slowly and modestly, the present current of warm sympathetic support may be chilled prematurely. The danger that cultist fads or over-optimistic enthusiasms may divert and then discourage sources of cooperation and funds is always present. Many limiting factors, often inadequately understood and appreciated both within and without the social sciences, remain to be overcome.¹ Some of these factors are as yet beyond the control of those engaged directly in research but others can be remedied

in large measure. Outstanding among these is the problem of finding effective ways of working together in facilitating the planning, financing, and conduct of research.

The expanding volume of research in the social sciences, the development of more rigorous and complex techniques, and the establishment of more critical standards of significance and performance are raising a long series of questions about the ways in which research has been organized and conducted. The discussion which follows is limited to organizational problems of research in the universities. There is need for similar examination of the problems of government research agencies, of independent research institutions unaffiliated with universities or the government, and of the many other bodies which influence the selection of research areas and problems, the utilization of research personnel, the financing of research, and its execution. Another wide range of problems concerns the establishment of effective communication between geographically dispersed research personnel or organizations working in related areas of investigation. The nature of these further problems is, however, very largely determined by that of the research base supplied by the universities. So far as one can now foresee, the universities in the United States will continue to provide the principal constant source of encouragement, initiative, support, and personnel for research in the social sciences.

RESISTANCE TO RESEARCH ORGANIZATION

The opinion that social science research needs formal organization in the universities is by no means as yet fully accepted by all social scientists. Among those who

¹ See Donald Young, "The Task of the Social Sciences in Human Relations: The Limiting Factors," a paper read at the winter meeting of the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia, February 6, 1948, to be published in a forthcoming issue of the Society's *Proceedings*; Donald Young and Paul Webbink, "Current Problems of Council Concern in Research Organization," *Social Science Research Council Items* 1(3):1-5 (September 1947).

do hold this view there is considerable diversity of judgment concerning the desirability of some sort of central university-wide research organization. The extensive growth of team—or as some would put it, “gang”—research is deplored by more than a few social scientists who contend that significant contributions of substance or methodology come only from the exceptionally gifted scientist who is left entirely free to go his own way. Individual and departmental autonomy are traditional in American universities. Many social scientists are apprehensive that more effective organization would break down cherished freedoms through the establishment of “bureaucratic” administrative controls. The belief that university administration is at its best when it administers least is widely held. The objections of those faculty members who are concerned about the loss of individual freedom often run parallel with resistances from those who through their own initiative and labor have created ad hoc research organizations in particular subject-matter fields.

The achievements of lone research workers are in no sense disparaged by recognition of the need for more formal organization of research. There presumably always will be outstanding individuals who because of the nature of their projects or of their individual personalities will work most productively if they are enabled to operate independently with few if any ties to a formal organizational framework. Rare, however, are the individuals whose work has not been enriched by the work and counsel of colleagues, the help of research assistants, or the labor of students. Rare, too, are those who have not been assisted by facilities supplied through at least a rudimentary form of university or college organization for the encouragement of research, or through some agency which finances research. Viewed objectively, the conflicts over research organization involve questions of degree and not of principle.

More complex are the questions of relationship between research organizations set up to work in particular areas of investigation and existing or proposed central university research organizations. Reasons why even institutes or other specialized research organizations working in a specific area have more to gain than to lose through the operation of a central organization are discussed below. Still more difficult are the problems arising from the varying degrees of independence of individual schools and colleges within particular universities. The traditional organizational pattern of a university may be so firmly established that a more effective organization will scarcely be thought appropriate or realizable.

² Its members are Louis Wirth (chairman), Gordon W. Blackwell, Frederick C. Mills, Stanley F. Teele, Donald H. Wallace, and Malcolm M. Willey.

NEED FOR RE-EXAMINATION OF RESPONSIBILITIES

The past four years have seen the creation of more than thirty university institutes, centers, and other units concerned with research programs in specific social science fields. Most of them are concentrated in the fields of labor and world area research but the interests of others range from attitude and opinion measurement to land use and housing research. At least a dozen universities have initiated active discussions of their social science research structures and policies. In several of them central social science research organizations have been established or revived; others are now seeking to chart their courses of action. There are few major campuses which have not evidenced some discontent with existing arrangements for facilitating research in the social sciences.

In the belief that a systematic examination of proposals for improved research organization will aid in clarifying issues which confront the universities, and that a wide interchange of views should be stimulated, the Council in 1946 established a Committee on Organization for Research in the Social Sciences.² It soon seemed evident to the committee that effective research organization in the universities is dependent upon their positive acceptance and effective allocation of some eleven key functions. Subsequent correspondence with leading social scientists and officers in many universities has confirmed the committee's judgment on this point. The several functions are enumerated and discussed in the following numbered paragraphs:

(1) Responsibility for the acceptance and expenditure of research funds must be clearly allocated whether the funds come from the university's own budget, from foundation grants, or from any other source which may be willing to subsidize or contract for research. Guarding the interest and scientific record of the university as a whole must be a first concern. There are indications that without the participation of a body specifically responsible for the orderly development of the university's research program, projects and funds may be accepted or rejected for reasons of expediency, without rigorous appraisal of the effects upon the long-run development of significant research programs, and without consideration of the availability of competent personnel or of the intrinsic feasibility and soundness of the proposal which is being offered. University administrative machinery is not usually designed to deal with problems such as these, and only in the most exceptional instances can it provide the amount of attention and the full professional competence required for effective appraisal of the planning or execution of research.

(2) There must be provision for orderly review and handling of the solicitation of funds for research in all institutions in which research is carried on actively. The confusion and complications which may otherwise result are obvious. Only a few institutions have established rigid controls over fund solicitation and, save where special patterns of policy have won acceptance, few seem likely to inhibit freedom of intercourse between their faculty members and reputable donors of funds. There is nevertheless a growing body of opinion that full and responsible consultation between any person seeking research funds and a stable and professionally competent body representing the university's research interests is essential if embarrassment to the university, to donors of funds, and to the university's research workers is to be avoided.

(3) A conscious and organized effort must be made to appraise the research needs of the social sciences periodically in relation to the most effective use of the research resources and personnel of the university. Only against the findings of such an appraisal can an intelligent judgment be reached as to whether proposed types of work merit the university's support. Ways in which important but unworked problems can be attacked, personnel enlisted, and funds obtained must be persistently canvassed. Of all the eleven functions this is most characteristically disregarded in all but a few universities.

(4) Competent counsel and guidance in the planning of research must be provided by every institution which wishes to make a major contribution to research in the social sciences. For obvious reasons guidance cannot be imposed effectively on unwilling individuals, but it should be available to those who are genuinely motivated to direct their research efforts toward adding to verifiable knowledge. It is particularly important in those institutions which are concerned with actively developing the research potentialities of their younger men. The experience of some institutions suggests that, regardless of the type of central organization, committees of specialists to advise on the planning of particular projects are frequently desirable, and that much is to be gained if advisers are drawn in from other universities. In universities having a competent central organization much time and effort on the part of research personnel can be saved if advice is given on the requisite facilities and prospective costs of proposed projects on the basis of past experience. Corollary with the general function of guidance is the function of continuing participation in the allocation of any general funds available for the support of research, and the inevitable necessity of developing defensible criteria for the appraisal of proposals for which the university is asked to accept some financial or moral responsibility.

(5) Provision for counsel in the prosecution of projects and in the appraisal of their final results is just as important as in planning. Considerable disturbance and frustration have been caused by failure to estimate properly the problems and costs involved in a research venture and to readjust plans in time to assure their successful completion. The appraisal of research findings is of course essential if the university contemplates financing their publication.

(6) Research organization in the university must be actively concerned with discovering and fostering the research interests and talents of its personnel if more than formal administrative purposes are to be served. The central research organizations of only a very few institutions make a conscious effort in this direction. These institutions have come to recognize the crucial importance of the years immediately following the doctorate. It is evident that performance of this function requires continuing consideration of the problems affecting the recruitment and training of students for research.

(7) Orderly provision of facilities for carrying on research is necessary if research workers are to work at the highest level of their capacities. Too often research in the social sciences suffers from the assumption that if adequate library services are provided the major need has been met, with little recognition of needs for statistical pools, tabulating equipment, a variety of other technical services, and for freeing research personnel from academic housekeeping tasks.

(8) Encouragement and assistance must be given to increase communication and cooperation between social science research workers in the same university, in other institutions, and in government or private research agencies. The contrary situation has not infrequently developed when the fortuitous possession of special funds or other resources has seemed to result in efforts to establish a monopoly of investigation and publication in a given research area.

(9) In most universities there is need for a focal administrative agency which would be responsible for effectively representing the viewpoint and the interests of social science research in discussion with the central administration. This responsibility is usually widely diffused and it is rarely carried out on the basis of informed consideration of all the functions noted above.

(10) A continuous record of research in progress and of research accomplished should be maintained, partly as a moral stimulus toward the completion of work and against inflation of personal claims regarding work under way.

(11) Practices regarding the stimulation and facilitation of publication of research findings vary between extreme limits. Re-examination of policies on this point,

in terms of steps likely to be conducive to the encouragement of significant research and to the most effective use of available funds, should constitute a part of any thoroughgoing evaluation of the present state of university research organization.

THE NEED FOR A FOCAL POINT

Examination of the experience of the universities which have most constantly encouraged research in the social sciences leads to the judgment that the functions just enumerated can be performed consistently and effectively only if a definite and stable focal point is provided for discussion and determination of major policy questions and the formulation of over-all research strategy. Though in a few special cases other forms of organization have been found effective, a university research committee or council has generally been the most satisfactory mechanism. The range of activities and authority of these bodies, however, has varied widely.

It seems equally clear that there is as yet no single organizational pattern which can be prescribed with confidence, and that much more analysis and operating experience are necessary before even tentative judgments can be made on many points. Each university's organization for research must be devised in accordance with its traditions, structure, thinking, and the state of its research resources. In many institutions a well-organized council, a research division, or some comparable body will be essential and feasible. Others may well be content for the time being with a central committee having limited authority, or perhaps only an advisory role. In still others the only immediately feasible step may be the formation of an informal group, to meet periodically for the purpose of clarifying views about ways of intensifying interest in research and of raising the university's standards of research achievement in the social sciences. If at a given stage of development it seems unwise or impractical to centralize responsibility for all of the eleven major organizational functions, there should at least be an explicit division of labor and a definite commitment to re-examine and, if desirable, reallocate functions periodically.

Relations between special or ad hoc research groups and institutes and the central research organization must similarly vary in accordance with the stage of research development in the university. That the special organizations may at times suffer what will be to them annoying interventions or restrictions if a strong central body develops cannot be denied; these restrictive regulations need not and should not pertain to matters other than those on which the administrative

officers of the university would eventually have to act anyway. If any regulatory actions which seem essential in a given university are exercised through a research organization, there can at least be assurance that the decisions are made by professionally competent colleagues rather than by administrators whose knowledge of research and of the social sciences may in many cases be limited. Once general policies have been formulated, intervention should be negligible if the scope of the ad hoc organization's program has been agreed upon mutually. Further relations should be concerned solely with facilitating joint action advancing the university's total research effort and not with dominating research operations.

Local circumstances will inevitably determine conclusions concerning the desirability of functioning through a general university council responsible for all areas of research, through a body dealing only with research in the social sciences, or one dealing jointly with work in the humanities and in the social sciences. The scope of any such organization cannot be determined on the basis of fixed rules. The one general principle which must be established, however, is that questions relating to the social sciences must be weighed and decided primarily by competent social scientists genuinely motivated by a desire to advance research.

ISSUES OF ORGANIZATIONAL POLICY

Certain cautions, based upon the experience of universities which have experimented actively with formal research organizations, can be noted only briefly.

Foremost is the point that, save under very exceptional conditions, university-wide research organizations must concentrate their efforts on facilitating research and on helping individuals and groups to carry out projects which they consider significant; the policing of research must be a secondary consideration. No central body can discharge its functions long or effectively if it assumes that its wisdom is greater on all points than that of the research workers in particular fields.

While the central organization must be concerned primarily with developing the university's general research activities and strengths, with counsel and guidance, and with specific assistance to research workers, it must on occasion be ready to accept the unpopular task of examining possible abuses and of initiating action to prevent their continuation.

The specific ways in which a central council or committee is selected and appointed will necessarily vary in the light of local circumstances. Several requirements have been established, however, by past experience: Some continuity of membership is essential. Domina-

tion by one or two outstanding individuals must be avoided. The members must be broadly representative of genuine research interests rather than of organizational or hierarchical interests. The concern of those appointed must extend beyond their own particular discipline. Rotation of membership should be mandatory. Care must be taken to have the committee consist preponderantly of individuals who are themselves actively engaged in research.

If an organization is set up at all, it must be a functioning and not a nominal body. Otherwise the development of research activity may be inhibited rather than advanced. No organization can function unless some amount of competent staff time is definitely made available for the purpose and officially recognized by the university. The staff task, like that of the central body, must not be permitted to become merely administrative and the staff secretary should never be selected solely for his administrative capacity. His own career must demonstrate understanding of and sympathy with research. He must have the respect of the members of his council or committee and of the faculty generally. He must be willing to submerge his own interests in the common task of advancing research in the university.

It is not possible here to consider the great variety of operating problems with which both university-wide and specialized research groups must struggle. These problems range from specifying the compensation to be paid research assistants through determining the advisability of accepting proffered research contracts. The Council's Committee on Organization for Research plans to publish within a few months a first report, dealing in some detail with the basic considerations affecting university research organization. The committee has also made a modest beginning in the analysis of specific operating problems through a preliminary inquiry into practices affecting contracts³ and has under way an examination of financial arrangements between universities and faculty members engaged in research. The committee's work thus far has been carried on primarily by correspondence and conversation. It hopes that it will succeed in stimulating specific comments from those who may question, confirm, or supplement its tentative findings.

³ *Summary of Replies to an Inquiry Concerning University Practices Relating to the Appraisal of Research Contracts in the Social Sciences* (May 1947, mimeographed).

TENSIONS AFFECTING INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

by Otto Klineberg *

AT ITS 1948 meeting the Program Commission of UNESCO adopted a resolution on "Tensions Affecting International Understanding." This resolution reads in part:

The Director General is instructed to promote: Enquiries into the distinctive character of the various national cultures; Enquiries into the conceptions which the people of one nation entertain of its own and of other nations; Enquiries into modern techniques which have been developed for changing mental attitudes and for revealing the processes and forces involved when human minds are in conflict; Enquiries into the influences throughout life which pre-dispose towards international understanding on the one hand and aggressive nationalism on the other.

* Dr. Klineberg is a member of the Department of Psychology at Columbia University. His current study of social science contributions to the understanding of international tensions was begun under the auspices of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and is being continued for the Council with the advice of a committee consisting of Donald Young (chairman), Frederick S. Dunn, John W. Gardner, Robert K. Merton, and Morris E. Opler.

In February 1948 the Program Committee of the U. S. National Commission for UNESCO referred this part of UNESCO's program to the Social Science Research Council, with the request that it make a critical study of the proposed investigations for the purpose of formulating the problems presented in a manner capable of scientific analysis. At the same time officers of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace invited the Council to undertake a project of the same general nature in close cooperation with its current European program which is concerned with realistic study of international affairs. The Council welcomed this opportunity to promote research in an area of crucial importance and arranged for the preparation of a memorandum which would summarize our present knowledge of social relations aspects of international tensions, and prepare the way for further relevant research.

In a field as broad and complex as this one, which touches upon so many different aspects of social science, no single memorandum could possibly do justice to

all the pertinent material. It is hoped, however, that the memorandum now in preparation can at least serve the purpose of indicating the more important problems involved, and some of the methods which are likely to throw some light upon them.

The memorandum will concern itself, first, with what may be called "personality in relation to nationality." It seems clearly important, in connection with international understanding, that people of one nation should be familiar with the folkways, the ideals, the moral standards, the basic attitudes of other national communities. The UNESCO resolution expresses the hope that this will stimulate "the sympathy and respect of nations for each other's ideals and aspirations and the appreciation of national problems."

The basic difficulty for the social scientist working in this area is the necessity of evaluating critically the various methods that have already been applied to the understanding of national differences, and of determining which of these, singly or in combination, are most likely to add to our knowledge. The memorandum will present a critical analysis of these methods—including descriptive accounts of one nation by members of other nations; analyses of vital and social statistics; interpretations by the ethnologists of contemporary national groups; psychiatric and psychoanalytic studies; content analysis of the cultural products of a nation; studies of individual communities; use of psychological tests and measurements; public opinion studies of the polling type; use of interviews and attitude scales; and description of child training and education, formal and informal. Some material is available under each of these topics, but there is considerable disagreement as to the extent to which the results obtained by any of these methods can be regarded as dependable. It seems clear that since every one of them by itself suffers from inadequate validation, the most hopeful approach is by means of a combined and varied attack, in which the results obtained by one method can validate those obtained by another.

The second major emphasis of the memorandum will be on the question of national images and stereotypes. Such stereotypes can be studied in their "public" manifestations, that is to say, by analysis of the ways in which members of various national groups are represented in mass media of communication and other material which may have an impact on a number of different individuals. The content analysis of newspapers, books, magazines, moving pictures, the stage, radio, school textbooks, diplomatic documents, etc. should be useful. A considerable amount of material is already available in this area. Stereotypes and national images have also been studied in the individual by a number of methods, and

it would seem valuable to compare the responses of individuals with the images presented in the mass media. Some material is also available on the development of stereotypes in children of different ages and on changes in the character of the stereotypes over time, particularly under the impact of political, economic, and international developments. It seems particularly essential to look into the question of stereotypes with reference to the amount of information or misinformation which they contain, and some studies are already available which indicate the extent to which stereotypes may be based upon inadequate and in some cases completely erroneous ideas. Knowledge of the nature of these stereotypes may represent an important first step in the educational processes envisioned by the UNESCO resolution. In any study of stereotypes, the basic data should include classifications of the population according to economic background, regional distribution, political and religious affiliation, degree of actual contact with other nationalities, etc. These data should throw light on some of the causal factors operating in this area.

The third major emphasis of the memorandum, and one which is closely related to the preceding, is represented by the problem of attitudes—their measurement, their content, the evaluation of techniques for bringing about change in attitudes, etc. The Social Science Research Council has already endeavored to advance research in this area through publication of a research planning bulletin by Robin M. Williams, Jr.¹ That bulletin deals mainly with relationships of subgroups within the American national community, but many of the same problems arise in connection with international relations. There are a number of special problems in this area which will require more detailed investigation, for example: attitudes toward nationalism, and internationalism; attitudes toward democracy; attitudes toward the inevitability of war; the relation of attitudes to political and religious ideologies. The crucial problem in this area relates to the possibility of changing attitudes, and here the experience in the United States with attitudes toward minority groups should at least yield valuable hypotheses which can be further developed.

Finally, there is the related problem of understanding the factors in individual development, particularly in the earlier experiences of the child, which play a part in forming cooperative or aggressive attitudes in adult life. In this field perhaps the major contributions have been made by psychiatrists and psychoanalysts on the one hand and cultural anthropologists on the other.

¹ *The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions: A Survey of Research on Problems of Ethnic, Racial, and Religious Group Relations*, Bulletin 57 (1947).

An attempt will be made to bring together at least some of the findings in these two fields. No immediate practical benefits can be envisioned from this approach, for obvious reasons, but from the long view it should not be neglected. According to present indications, the International Congress on Mental Health to be held in London in August will be especially concerned with this and related problems, but it is felt that they should not be overlooked in the memorandum.

Although this outline of the memorandum has dealt separately with four major aspects of tensions affecting international understanding, an attempt will be made to show how all these aspects are closely integrated.

One cannot, for example, study the question of national images without at the same time dealing with attitudes toward other nations. Nor can one study these images without at the same time being concerned with the extent to which they actually reflect national differences in personality. Every one of the aspects of this general problem of international tensions appears to be related to every other. Although a memorandum which seeks to examine so many different kinds of material will necessarily fail to do complete justice to any one, it seems most useful at this stage to present an extensive rather than an intensive account, so that the problem may be seen in broad perspective.

COMMITTEE BRIEFS

ECONOMIC HISTORY

Arthur H. Cole (chairman), Earl J. Hamilton, Herbert Heaton, John G. B. Hutchins, Harold A. Innis, Leland H. Jenks, Edward C. Kirkland, Frederic C. Lane, Robert Warren.

Two major publications of the committee in the general field of entrepreneurial history are scheduled for early release: *Revolution in Glassmaking* by Warren C. Scoville is to be issued by the Harvard University Press on May 26, and *Men, Cities, and Transportation: A Study in New England History, 1820-1900* by Edward C. Kirkland, in two volumes, on June 30. The books previously published under the committee's auspices have dealt with the role of government in American economic development, the committee's other major area of concentration. Arrangements are now being made for a third publication in entrepreneurial history, namely, the first volume of a study of the Brown family of Providence, by James B. Hedges. This volume will cover the rise of the family's business activities from the date of the first available concrete evidence, around 1725, to the 1780's when reorientation of the family's business life was necessitated by the change in economic conditions following the Peace of Paris. Although the author plans to analyze the later history of the Brown family, the first volume will be published independently. The committee is also arranging for early publication of a history of the development of the corporation in New Jersey prior to 1875, by John W. Cadman, Jr.

The committee has awarded six fellowships in economic history, as reported on page 11, *infra*.

FAMILY RESEARCH

E. W. Burgess (chairman), Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. (staff director), Stanley P. Davies, A. Irving Hallowell, Emily H. Mudd, Robert R. Sears.

During the past winter members of the Council's board of directors and staff reviewed the need for a new effort to plan and stimulate research on the family. Funds were subsequently provided the Council by the Grant Founda-

tion for a planning project having the following scope and purposes:

(1) indication, by a selective survey, of the nature and adequacy of the services to the family now available through the professions, family service agencies, family life education programs, and centers for marriage and family counseling;

(2) analysis of the gaps in our knowledge of the family and the research now needed, particularly in terms of scientific findings which can be applied by those engaged in services to the family and in the preparation of young people for marriage and parenthood;

(3) suggestion of research projects to deal with shortcomings of present knowledge in terms of their priorities with reference to (a) scientific knowledge and (b) practical means of strengthening family life;

(4) recommendation of feasible measures for the improvement of services to the family by the agencies and the professions now engaged in action in the field.

Work on this program was started in April under the direction of Dr. Cottrell, with the aid of an advisory committee representing fields most concerned with research on the family.

HISTORIOGRAPHY

Ralph E. Turner (chairman), Samuel Brockunier (secretary), Eugene N. Anderson, Shepard B. Clough, Thomas C. Cochran, Elmer Ellis, Bert J. Loewenberg.

The recent appointment of a new committee to resume work in historiography is a direct outgrowth of the response of historians to the report of the Council's earlier committee in this field, *Theory and Practice in Historical Study*, SSRC Bulletin 54 (1946). This response was varied and provocative. Certain of the reviews indicated an incompleteness in the work of the committee which called for serious consideration. As a result Dr. Jeannette P. Nichols, a member of the original committee, was designated to seek opinions and make recommendations. She secured five critical memoranda from reviewers and others in the spring

of 1947 and arranged for a series of discussions at the subsequent annual meetings of the American Historical Association, its Pacific Coast branch, and the Mississippi Valley Historical Association. The papers presented at these meetings caused a lively and constructive series of discussions.

At the suggestion of members of the former committee a conference on desirable next steps was held in New York on January 17, 1948, attended by members of that committee and other historians and presided over by Merle Curti. After extended consideration of the memoranda, the papers presented at the annual meetings, and a stenographic report of the discussion at the AHA session, the conference recommended the appointment of a new Committee on Historiography to prepare a supplementary bulletin. This bulletin might include (1) an essay defining the social science approach to history; (2) a survey of the various schools of thought, or philosophies of history, in current use with special reference to the problem of accounting for sequences in time; (3) a report on the type of problems which social scientists and humanists as well as historians think the historian ought to explore; (4) a series of illustrative case studies, analyzing the different ways of treating historical problems by historians, to explore whether they might be handled more effectively by using social science concepts and techniques; and (5) an analysis of why differences in interpretation of facts have existed in the making of the history of great developments such as the French Revolution. These recommendations of the conference were approved by the Council's Committee on Problems and Policy, and the new Committee on Historiography held an organizational meeting on May 22-23.

HOUSING RESEARCH

Richard U. Ratcliff (chairman), Howard G. Brunsman, Nicholas J. Demerath, Ernest M. Fisher, Robert B. Mitchell, Arthur M. Weimer, Louis Wirth, Coleman Woodbury; *staff*, Gerald Breese.

"Frontiers in Housing Research" will be the focus of a symposium to be held at the University of Wisconsin, September 2-4, 1948, in connection with the University's centennial celebration. The symposium will be under the joint sponsorship of the Council's Committee on Housing Research and the University's Committee on the Regional Planning Course. Richard U. Ratcliff of the School of Commerce, University of Wisconsin, will be in charge of the symposium. Ernest Fisher, Director of the Institute for Urban Land Use and Housing Studies, Columbia University, is chairman of the Program Committee. Papers will be presented by several authorities now engaged in housing research. Present plans include sessions on the following four subjects: the neighborhood concept in theory and application; the relationship between technological and social research in housing; measuring effective demand in the housing market; and housing needs and housing standards. There will be a special address on Richard T. Ely and his historic contribution to the development of research in land economics and housing. Guests will have an oppor-

tunity to examine in detail the work of the United States Forest Products Laboratory as it relates to housing research. Further information may be secured from the chairman or staff of the Committee on Housing Research.

PACIFIC COAST COMMITTEE

ON COMMUNITY STUDIES

Leonard Bloom (chairman), Allen L. Edwards, Calvin F. Schmid, Eshref Shevky, Robert C. Tryon, Paul Wallin.

The committee will meet in San Francisco on June 19-21. At the previous meeting on December 20, 1947, Dr. Shevky reported on a monograph in preparation dealing with the measurement of socio-economic variables in contrasting social areas in Los Angeles. The program of the June meeting includes reports by Dr. Schmid on research implications of the state-wide tracing of Washington, and by Messrs. Shevky and Bloom on the selection and differentiation of ethnic samples.

PACIFIC COAST COMMITTEE

ON SOCIAL STATISTICS

Davis McEntire (chairman), Maurice I. Gershenson, George M. Kuznets, William Robinson, Calvin F. Schmid, Dorothy S. Thomas.

The committee plans to meet in Seattle early in June. Members of the committee and representatives of the Department of Health and other state agencies will confer on methods of improving the collection of social statistics, and on the training of students in statistics.

PUBLIC LIBRARY INQUIRY

Robert D. Leigh (chairman), Ralph A. Beals, J. Frederic Dewhurst, Donald G. Marquis, Mary U. Rothrock, Richard H. Shryock, Malcolm M. Willey; *staff*, Robert D. Leigh, director.

The program of field visits by staff members of the inquiry to the libraries in its sample has now been completed, with the exception of a few libraries in small communities in the East. The five staff members assigned to these visits report that they gained insight into external pressures on libraries, library problems and personnel, which could not have been secured otherwise.

Since the first of the year questionnaires designed to secure the specific information needed for various special studies have been sent to cooperating libraries. These cover such subjects as library processes, personnel, music and record libraries, film collections, and library use of government publications. The personnel questionnaires were compiled by Alice Bryan and administered in personal visits to the libraries in the sample with the aim of obtaining complete coverage of the professional and subprofessional personnel in each library, as well as surveying administrative personnel practices and attitudes.

The survey of citizen use of the library, using a national sample, has been completed by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center, the returns tabulated, and the final report submitted.

SLAVIC STUDIES

(Joint with the American Council of Learned Societies)

Philip E. Mosely (chairman), Ernest J. Simmons (secretary), Percy E. Corbett, Merle Fainsod, Robert J. Kerner, Geroid T. Robinson, S. Harrison Thomson, René Wellek.

At its first meeting on March 21 the committee took note of the strenuous efforts which are being made to make the *American Slavic and East European Review* an effective organ of the entire field of Slavic studies, with added emphasis on the contributions of the social sciences, as well as of the financial assistance which is being given currently by ten universities. It strongly recommended that financial support be sought for a three-year period to enable the *Review* to become a self-supporting organ of Slavic studies in America.

The committee decided to explore the need for preparation of annual lists of research projects in the field of Slavic studies, for promotion of effective programs of summer training in the Slavic field, and for intensive consultation on special fields of research problems. Mortimer Graves of the ACLS reported on the status and plans of its translation program, on the prospects for making available in this country a substantial selection of significant newspaper and periodical articles appearing in the Soviet press, and on the program for reproducing Russian works of special value for students in the various fields of Russian studies.

The committee discussed at length the problem of effecting adequate procurement of books from the Soviet Union, and recommended that first priority be given to this problem through the appointment of a Subcommittee on Procurement of Soviet Materials, empowered to draw up concrete plans for improving the flow of materials. In April the executive officers of the sponsoring Councils approved the appointment of a subcommittee consisting of Percy E. Corbett (chairman), Abram Bergson, and Sergius Yakobson. The subcommittee has been making a survey of the various methods of procurement and of needs, and is planning an early meeting to discuss alternative plans of procurement.

SOCIAL SCIENCE PERIODICALS FOR EUROPE

Philip E. Mosely (chairman), Richard Heindel, Thorsten Sellin.

A preliminary survey of the needs of universities and other research institutions in Europe for current American periodicals in the social sciences, prepared by the chairman, was considered in detail at the committee's first meeting on April 17. The committee had the assistance of Norman S. Buchanan of the Rockefeller Foundation, who recently returned from an extensive survey of social science work in Europe. As a result of the discussion, plans for a two-year project were formulated which would provide a fairly broad selection of periodicals for nearly 50 leading universities, a narrower selection for about 60 more universities, and additional selections in special fields for some 40 research institutes. The list of proposed recipients covers 21

countries—all countries of Europe except Switzerland, which has no shortage of dollar resources, the U.S.S.R., which carries out its own procurement of American periodicals on a substantial scale, and Germany and Austria, whose needs for periodicals are being met under a special program financed by the Rockefeller Foundation.

In presenting this project to the Council with a recommendation for further action, the committee stressed both the immediate needs of European social science students and research workers, arising from the continuing emergency and the longer-range problem of promoting communication among social scientists working in various countries.

PERSONNEL

PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL

At the April meeting of the board of directors Pendleton Herring of the Carnegie Corporation of New York was elected President of the Council, succeeding Donald Young who will take office as General Director of the Russell Sage Foundation in July. Dr. Herring has served as a director of the Council for the past two years, at the designation of the American Political Science Association. He has been a member of the Council's Committee on Problems and Policy since 1942, of the Committee on War Studies since its establishment in 1943, and of the joint Committee on International Exchange of Persons since its appointment. Dr. Herring was first associated with the Council through appointment to a former Committee on Pressure Groups and Propaganda in 1931. He served also as chairman of the Committee on Social Science Personnel and of the former Committee on Political Behavior, as vice-chairman and staff of the former Committee on Public Administration, and as a member of several other committees.

A former member of the Department of Government at Harvard University, Dr. Herring has been an officer of the Carnegie Corporation of New York since 1946. He served as secretary of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission in preparing the first report on atomic energy control submitted to the Security Council, and directed the Atomic Energy Commission Group in the United Nations Department of Security Affairs from June 1946 to April 1947. Dr. Herring will take office as President of the Council on June 15.

RESEARCH TRAINING FELLOWSHIPS

At a meeting on April 16 the Committee on Social Science Personnel considered the applications for research training fellowships received since its January meeting, and made the following 18 appointments:

Joe Kennedy Adams, Ph.M. University of Wisconsin, Ph.D. candidate Princeton University, Psychology, for research on communication analysis, with training in semantics and psychology
Margaret R. Beattie, M.A. Cornell University, Ph.D. candidate Cornell University, American History, for

training in agricultural economics and research on the social and economic history of land use and ownership in the Corn Belt

John C. Brown, B.A. University of Florida, Ph.D. candidate University of Chicago, Political Science, for training in techniques of attitude measurement and field research on presidential party leaders' attitudes as factors in predicting future party behavior

David Bushnell, B.A. Harvard College, Ph.D. candidate Harvard University, History, for a study in Colombia of the liberal movement during the first years of that country's independence

Thomas F. Carroll, M.S. Cornell University, Ph.D. candidate Cornell University, Agricultural Economics, for training in methods for measuring the agricultural resources of regions and their level of utilization

Carl Christ, B.S. University of Chicago, Ph.D. candidate University of Chicago, Economics, for study and research on the construction and testing of econometric models for the prediction of the future course of economic variables

Francis H. Conroy, M.A. University of California, Ph.D. candidate University of California, History, for a study of social and cultural aspects of Japanese expansion into Hawaii

Charlotte J. Erickson, M.A. Cornell University, Ph.D. candidate Cornell University, History, for study of the recruitment of European immigrant labor by American industry, 1865-85

Alona E. Evans, Ph.D. Duke University, International Law, for a comparative study of the enforcement of international law through executive and legislative action and by judicial interpretation in Mexico

Nelson N. Foote, B.S. Cornell University, Ph.D. candidate Cornell University, Sociology, for study of the role of the professional class in relation to labor and management in Detroit

Franklin L. Ford, B.A. University of Minnesota, Ph.D. candidate Harvard University, History, for study in France of the role of the French aristocracy during the feudal reaction, 1715-40

Solomon B. Levine, M.B.A. Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, Ph.D. candidate Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Industrial Economics, for field study of the effects of technological change upon union-management relations in the New England woolen and worsted textile industry

Alan S. Manne, B.A. Harvard College, Ph.D. candidate Harvard University, Economics, for research on joint cost and supply relations of refined petroleum products in the United States

Harold Orlansky, B.S.S. College of the City of New York, Ph.D. candidate Yale University, Anthropology, for study of the patterns of British culture, by a synthesis of community studies in England

Robert A. Potash, M.A. Harvard University, Ph.D. candidate Harvard University, History, for research on early industrial development in Mexico, 1821-46

Allen M. Potter, M.A. Wesleyan University, Ph.D. candidate Columbia University, Government, for field study of party discipline and leadership under the British party system in comparison with these phenomena in the United States

John S. Reshetar, Jr., M.A. Harvard University, Ph.D. candidate Harvard University, Political Science,

for training at the Russian Institute, Columbia University

Richard S. Suter, B.A. Harvard College, Ph.D. candidate Columbia University, Government, for research on Soviet federalism 1919-25 with particular reference to public administration

The committee also granted extensions of awards previously made to the following fellows of the Council: Gerrit P. Judd, IV, Yale University; Russell E. F. Planck, Columbia University; Eugene V. Schneider, Harvard University; Ralph H. Turner, University of Chicago.

Continuance of the Social Science Research Council's fellowship offerings for the coming three years has been assured by a new grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. New fellowship policies recently adopted by the Council give priority to the objective of stimulating and assisting in the development of more adequate programs of research training in graduate schools. A continuing purpose is to enable individuals to supplement their regular doctoral training by further study or experience which is not otherwise available to them. As heretofore, eligibility will be limited to persons who show exceptional promise of becoming effective research workers. In pursuit of the first-mentioned objective, the Council will be glad to have potential applicants called to its attention while they are still at early stages of their graduate schooling, so that plans for their further training can be discussed with them and their teachers while many options still remain open. Appointment as a fellow of the Council will, as a rule, be deferred until the applicant has completed the usual requirements for the doctorate with the exception of the dissertation.

There will be no departure from the long-established principle that Social Science Research Council fellowships are training fellowships and are not available for the support of projects which, however meritorious and important for other reasons, cannot be regarded as contributing significantly to the individual's technical competence. The Council is especially interested in creating opportunities for advanced students to gain practical research experience under a quasi-apprenticeship relation to a research organization or a competent and active individual research worker, preferably in association with a number of other "apprentices." It is contemplated that the Council will undertake, through staff members or designated advisers, to keep in closer touch with both the planning and the execution of each fellow's training program.

A circular setting forth the terms of the fellowship offerings in more detail will be distributed this summer. The members of the committee in charge of fellowship awards are Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. (chairman), Fred Eggan, Glen Heathers, Philip E. Mosely, Elbridge Sibley, and Paul Web-bink. Laura Barrett is secretary to the committee, and all inquiries concerning fellowships should be addressed to her at the New York office of the Council.

ECONOMIC HISTORY FELLOWSHIPS

The Committee on Economic History has made its first awards under the special program of fellowships in economic history which was announced in the December 1947 issue of *Items*. The following six students have received appointments:

- John H. Dales, M.A. University of Toronto, Ph.D. candidate Harvard University, Economics, for study and for research on the development of the hydroelectric industry in Canada
- Robert B. Johnson, M.A. University of Michigan, Ph.D. candidate University of Minnesota, Economic History, for preparation of a dissertation on government regulation of economic enterprise in Virginia, 1750-1820
- Harold C. Passer, B.S. Harvard University, Ph.D. candidate Harvard University, Economics, for preparation of a history of the electrical manufacturing industry in the United States
- Jelle C. Riemersma, M.S. Delft Technische Hoogeschool, Ph.D. candidate University of California, Sociology, for research on the development of early capitalism as influenced by the Protestant ethics of some Dutch merchant groups, 1500-1700
- Robert R. Staley, M.S. California Institute of Technology, M.A. candidate Stanford University, History, for study of economic history and for research on the role of government in the Pennsylvania economy, 1681-1776
- Clarence L. Ver Steeg, M.A. Columbia University, Ph.D. candidate Columbia University, History, for research on the career of Robert Morris as Superintendent of Finance in the American Revolution

GRANTS-IN-AID

The Committee on Grants-in-Aid—Blair Stewart (chairman), Paul W. Gates, Willard C. Olson, Joseph J. Spengler, and Kimball Young—held its annual meeting on April 1-2. The following 40 grants were made for the completion of research projects currently under way:

- David P. Boder, Professor of Psychology, Illinois Institute of Technology, for a study of psychological and anthropological components in personal histories of displaced persons, with special reference to personality changes attributable to extreme stress
- Gray C. Boyce, Professor of History, Northwestern University, for preparation of a completely revised and augmented edition of *A Guide to the Study of Medieval History*
- Eberhard F. Bruck, Research Associate in Law, Harvard University, for a history of the migration of a religious idea through the laws of the Eastern and Western world (renewal)
- Henry A. Bullock, Professor of Sociology, Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College, for a study of urban mortality and community disorganization
- Robert F. Byrnes, Assistant Professor of History, Rutgers University, for analysis of the character and significance of the anti-Semitic movement in the Third Republic
- Gwendolen M. Carter, Associate Professor of Government, Smith College, for a study of the impact of problems of international security upon the members of the British Commonwealth of Nations and upon relations within the Commonwealth, 1939-49

- Lynn M. Case, Associate Professor of European History, University of Pennsylvania, for an analysis of French opinion on foreign affairs during the Second Empire
- Elizabeth Cometti, Assistant Professor of History, Woman's College, University of North Carolina, for a study of the impact of war on the civilians of the American Revolution
- Luther S. Cressman, Head, Department of Anthropology, University of Oregon, for a reconstruction of the pre-history of the Klamath Indians and their place in post-pluvial Great Basin culture
- Raymond E. Crist, Professor of Geography, University of Maryland, for a geographic survey of the east-west valley of the Island of Hispaniola, from Port-au-Prince, Haiti, to Barajona, Dominican Republic
- Edward W. Fox, Assistant Professor of History, Cornell University, for a study of the origins of the Dreyfus affair in French party politics, 1893-97
- Noel P. Gist, Professor of Sociology, University of Missouri, for a study of the movement of urban population into agricultural areas
- Joseph H. Greenberg, Assistant Professor of Anthropology, University of Minnesota, for a study of the historical background of Arabic magic
- J. P. Guilford, Professor of Psychology, University of Southern California, for a factor analysis of 65 tests developed by the Army Air Forces for the classification of aircrew personnel (renewal)
- Paul K. Hatt, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Princeton University, for development of a scaling technique for measuring occupational prestige
- Norman S. Hayner, Professor of Sociology, University of Washington, for a study of differential changes in the social institutions of Mexican village, town, and metropolis
- Vernon H. Jensen, Professor of Industrial Relations, New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, for a history of industrial relations in the nonferrous metals industry (renewal)
- Gladys M. Kammerer, Associate Professor of Political Science, University of Kentucky, for a study of the administration of congressional staff services
- Cyrus H. Karraker, Professor of European History, Bucknell University, for a study of the social and economic significance of piracy in the American Colonies
- George Kish, Assistant Professor of Geography, University of Michigan, for a study of Oriental influence on Western cartography, 1500-1800 A.D.
- Samuel J. Konefsky, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Brooklyn College, for an investigation of the crisis of liberalism: a study of the conflict of ideas within the Supreme Court
- Harvey J. Locke, Associate Professor of Sociology, University of Southern California, for research on the prediction of adjustment in subsequent marriages of divorced persons (renewal)
- Alma M. Luckau, Assistant Professor of History, Vassar College, for a study of the relations between the German army and the Soviet government, 1920-33
- Charles L. Lundin, Assistant Professor of History, Indiana University, for a study of the growth of German annexationist interest in the eastern Baltic region, 1868-1939
- Donald L. McMurtry, Professor of History, Russell Sage College, for a study of the American Railway Union strike of 1894
- William B. Michael, Assistant Professor of Psychology, Princeton University, for an investigation of the

factorial structure of reasoning, space, and visualization and of the influence of the scoring formula used upon loadings of these factors

Donald G. Morgan, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Mount Holyoke College, for a study of the life and constitutional philosophy of a Jeffersonian judge, Justice William Johnson, the first dissenter

Francis S. Philbrick, Professor Emeritus of Law, University of Pennsylvania, for preparation of an introduction to the laws of the Illinois Territory, 1809-18

David H. Pinkney, Assistant Professor of History, University of Missouri, for a study of Paris under the Second Empire: the emergence of a modern metropolis

S. Fanny Simon, Teacher of Economics, James Monroe High School, New York City, for a study of the influence of Juan B. Justo and Luis E. Recabarren on the political and social life of Argentina and Chile

Harold G. Skilling, Assistant Professor of Government, Dartmouth College, for a study of the Czech-German national conflict in Bohemia, 1867-1939

Graham H. Stuart, Professor of Political Science, Stanford University, for a history of the organization, procedure, and personnel of the Department of State (renewal)

Theo Surányi-Unger, Professor of Economics, Syracuse University, for an institutional analysis of private enterprise versus collective planning

Harry H. Turney-High, Professor of Anthropology and Sociology, University of South Carolina, for a study of the social anthropology of the "Turks" of Sumter County, South Carolina

Floyd L. Vaughan, Professor of Marketing, University of Oklahoma, for a study of the English patent system, with particular reference to compulsory licensing and other aspects which differ from our patent system

Eric Voegelin, Professor of Government, Louisiana State University, for completion of a history of political ideas (renewal)

Bernard D. Weinryb, Director, Jewish Teachers' Seminary and Peoples University, for a study of the economic and social development of the Middle East

Heinz Werner, Professor of Psychology, Clark University, for completion of experimental studies of semantic and communicative aspects of language behavior (renewal)

Bell I. Wiley, Professor of History, Louisiana State University, for a study of the life and character of the common soldier of the Union Army

Walter L. Wright, Jr., Professor of Turkish Language and History, Princeton University, for a field study of developments in Turkey since July 1, 1943

The Council's grant-in-aid program has been operated since 1926 for the purpose of encouraging research by mature scholars who do not have access to adequate funds for the support of projects. Grants are usually limited to \$1,000 for completion of well-organized studies upon which considerable progress has been made. Inquiries as to applications for aid in 1949-50 should be addressed to Laura Barrett at the New York office of the Council.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

BOOKS

The Labor Force in the United States 1890-1960 by John D. Durand. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1948. Pp. 302. \$2.50.

American Opinion on World Affairs in the Atomic Age by Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. and Sylvia Eberhart. Based on a report prepared for the Council's former Committee on Social Aspects of Atomic Energy. Introduction by Frederick Osborn. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1948. Pp. c. 140. \$2.50.

Men, Cities, and Transportation: A Study in New England History, 1820-1900 by Edward C. Kirkland. Published in cooperation with the Committee on Economic History. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948. 2 volumes. Pp. c. 1000. \$12.50.

Revolution in Glassmaking: Entrepreneurship and Technological Change in the American Industry, 1880-1920 by Warren C. Scoville. Prepared under the direction of the Committee on Economic History in collaboration with the Committee on Technological Change, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948. Pp. 398. \$5.00.

SSRC BULLETIN AND PAMPHLET SERIES

The Recruitment, Selection, and Training of Social Scientists, Bulletin 58, by Elbridge Sibley. June 1948. Pp. c. 170. \$1.50.

Social Adjustment in Old Age: A Research Planning Report, Bulletin 59, by Otto Pollak with the assistance of Glen Heathers. In press. Pp. c. 200. \$1.75.

Area Research and Training: A Conference Report on the Study of World Areas, Pamphlet 6, by Charles Wagley. In press. Pp. c. 60. 75 cents.

All numbers in the Council's bulletin and pamphlet series are distributed from the New York office of the Council.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

230 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

Incorporated in the State of Illinois, December 27, 1924, for the purpose of advancing research in the social sciences

Directors 1948: RALPH L. BEALS, WENDELL C. BENNETT, JAMES C. BONBRIGHT, E. W. BURGESS, SHEPARD B. CLOUGH, LEONARD S. COTTRELL, JR., JOSEPH S. DAVIS, J. FREDERIC DEWHURST, FREDERICK S. DUNN, ELMER ELLIS, ROBERT B. HALL, SHELBY M. HARRISON, PENDLETON HERRING, CARL I. HOVLAND, HAROLD A. INNIS, CHARLES E. MERRIAM, ROY F. NICHOLS, WILLARD C. OLSON, J. ROBERT OPPENHEIMER, FREDERICK OSBORN, A. T. POFFENBERGER, ROBERT R. SEARS, JOSEPH J. SPENGLER, BLAIR STEWART, WILLIAM DUNCAN STRONG, WILLARD L. THORP, RALPH W. TYLER, S. S. WILKS, DONALD YOUNG, KIMBALL YOUNG

Staff: DONALD YOUNG, *President*; PAUL WEBBINK; ELBRIDGE SIBLEY; ELEANOR C. ISBELL; GLEN HEATHERS; CHARLES WAGLEY; GERALD BREESE; JOHN G. TURNBULL; HAROLD E. JONES, *Pacific Coast Representative*; CAROLYN E. ALLEN, *Controller*